## **REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1, 4-11, 20 and 22-25 are pending in this application. Claim 11 has been withdrawn by the Examiner. By this Amendment, Claims 1 and 6 are amended, and Claims 23-25 are added. No new matter is added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Langman during the November 10, 2010 telephone interview. The reasons warranting favorable action discussed during the interview are incorporated into the following remarks and constitute Applicant's' separate record of the interview.

The Official Action rejects Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Claim 6 is amended as discussed during the interview to obviate the rejection. In particular, Claim 6 recites that the glazing panel includes only one pane of glass, and the pane of glass is toughened. These features are discussed in the specification at, for example, page 7, second paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The rejection of Claims 1, 4-10, 20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is obviated by the above amendments to Claims 1 and 6. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Official Action rejects Claims 1, 4-10, 20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of the combination of U.S. Patent No. 4,618,088 to Karla, U.S. Patent No. 4,119,425 to Marriott, European Application Publication No. 1110431 to Castle et al. ("Castle"), and U.S. Application Publication No. 2001/0002982 A1 to Sarkhel et al. ("Sarkhel").

During the interview, applicants' representative discussed differences between the invention at issue here and the applied references. However, to more clearly distinguish over the applied references, Claim 1 is amended to define that the second electrically conductive component comprises two spaced apart connector feet which are each joined to the first electrically conductive component by a lead-free solder, the second electrically conductive component also comprising a connector bridge connected to both of the connector feet, the connector bridge being spaced from the first electrically conductive component so that an area of the first electrically conductive component so that an area of the first electrically conductive component between the spaced apart connection points is exposed. On exemplary embodiment of this configuration is shown in Fig. 1 of the application. However, the claims are not limited by the exemplary embodiment.

None of the applied references discloses the claimed second electrically conductive component. For instance, Karla's current connecting element 14 (which the Official Action says corresponds to the claimed second electrically conductive element) does not have two spaced apart connector feet nor a connector bridge connected to both of the connector feet. The conductive elements 26, 27 disclosed by Marriott also do not have the claimed spaced apart connector feet nor the claimed connector bridge connected to both of the connector feet. Castle and Sarkhel fail to cure the deficiencies of Karla and Marriott. Thus, independent Claim 1 is patentable over Karla, Marriott, Castle and Sarkhel for at least these reasons.

Claims 4-10 and 20 are patentable over the applied references at least by virtue of their dependence from patentable independent Claim 1. Thus, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in these dependent claims is not set forth at this time.

New dependent Claim 23 defines further aspects of the second electrically

conductive component not disclosed by the applied references. New independent

Claim 24 is similar to Claim 1, but defines the second electrically conductive

component in a different manner. None of the applied references discloses the

second electrically conductive component defined in independent Claim 24. New

Claim 25 depends from independent Claim 24 and is patentable for at least this

reason.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the

Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful

in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application the undersigned

respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: December 2, 2010

By: /David R. Kemeny/

Matthew L. Schneider

Registration No. 32814

David R. Kemeny

Registration No. 57241

Customer No. 21839

703 836 6620